DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 618 AC 012 715

AUTHOR Friedland, William H.
TITLE Migrant Labor: Teaching, Research and Policy; A Final Report to the Ford Foundation on a Four Year Project.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 1 Feb 71
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; *College Students; *Course Evaluation; Credit Courses; Curriculum Enrichment; Field Studies; Migrant Workers; Research Projects; Social Sciences; *Sociology; Student Evaluation; *Student Research; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

This study involving migrant agricultural workers began in 1966 and continued for four summers. In its initial conception, the two projects that were carried on, the Cornell Migrant Labor Project and the California Agricultural Workers Study, were intended to accomplish three basic functions: (1) to influence the development of policy; (2) to integrate more effectively the functions of instruction and research by involving undergraduates in policy-oriented study and by utilizing their own work to provide the basis for sociological instruction; and (3) to make contributions to general sociology. Only the second of these was significantly accomplished. The integration of teaching and research in the program was carried out through four phases of activity: (1) careful selection of student participants; (2) a preparatory seminar held during the semester preceding the summer field work; (3) field research during an eight-week period in summer; and (4) an analysis seminar held during the semester following the summer field work. Results of a questionnaire evaluating the impact of the project on the students showed their approval of this method of sociological instruction. (CL)

ED 064618

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MIGRANT LABOR--TEACHING, RESEARCH AND POLICY

A Final Report to the Ford Foundation on a Four Year Project

William H. Friedland
Professor of Community Studies and Sociology
University of California, Santa Cruz

February 1, 1971

AC 012 715

CORNELL MIGRANT LABOR PROJECT
CALIFORNIA SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL WORKERS STUDY

PARTICIPANTS

1966

George Price

Roger Stetter

1967

*Janet Perkins Carter
Les Durant
Howard Gladston
*Harry Hutchinson
Michael Rotkin
John Rounds
Leonard Rubin
Lucy Whyte Russo
Nedra Sanfilippo
**Judith Stewart
Edd Taub
*Graham Wiggins

1968

Jane Avery
David Gruenberg
Arthur Kimmel
Sandra Grotberg Kistler
Craig Leslie
Iles Minoff
*Lee Packer
*Jessalyn Pendarvis
David Rindos
Marie-Celeste Scully
Lillian Trager

1969

Tom Allen
Tim Clanton
Edward Flaherty
Elliot Gong
Christine Johnson
Susan Miller
Gilbert Stein
**Jean Wharton

William H. Friedland,
Principal Investigator

Dorothy Nelkin,
Research Associate 1966-1969

Karen Rotkin,
Research Assistant 1969-1970

*Tuskegee Institute
**Graduate Research Assistant

INTRODUCTION

This report constitutes the final formal report to the Ford Foundation on its support for a two year period to the continuation of a study involving migrant agricultural workers. This work, initiated at Cornell University in the summer of 1966, continued sequentially for four summers. The first three focused upon work in New York State with some auxiliary study in New Jersey. In the final summer, 1969, the field work was conducted in California following the transfer of the principal investigator to the University of California at Santa Cruz.

In its initial conception, the two projects that were carried on--the Cornell Migrant Labor Project (CMLP) and the California Seasonal Agricultural Workers study (C/SAW)--were intended to accomplish three basic functions. First, the study was intended to have distinct policy implications. Unlike many sociological studies intended to enhance the body of knowledge, this project was intended to influence the development of policy. The second goal was concerned with integrating more effectively the twin functions of instruction and research by involving undergraduates in policy-oriented study and by utilizing their own work to provide the basis for sociological instruction. Finally, the study was intended to make contributions to general sociology, either to the development of theory or to specific sub-sections of the discipline.

This report provides an evaluation to the Foundation of the degree to which these objectives were accomplished. It will be seen that, in some ways, some distinctive successes were registered, particularly in the area of integrating teaching and research. In other ways, the program has been less successful--particularly up to the present time. In particular, the expectations that policy with respect to agricultural labor would be affected have been disappointed. Agricultural labor continues to remain one of the least-legislated areas of American society, and we cannot point to any signal successes emerging from this project.

In retrospect, however, there have been a number of consequences from the project that were unanticipated. One such consequence has been the creation of Community Studies at the University of California at Santa Cruz. While Community Studies was envisioned by its creators at Santa Cruz independently of the principal investigator, the fortuitous conjunction of their interests and those of the writer led to a shift from Cornell to Santa Cruz where the writer has been crucially involved in the establishment of a program involving undergraduates in instruction, research and action.

One section of this report has been prepared in its entirety by the student participants in the project. After obtaining responses to an initial questionnaire seeking information from all participants, a group of six participants were called together and left with the responsibility for writing that section of the report dealing with the effects of the project on the students. Their report has been included here untouched except for editorial details.

I would be derelict if I did not point out to the Foundation the important contribution made to this project by my former Research Associate at Cornell, Mrs. Dorothy Nelkin. Mrs. Nelkin participated in all aspects of the project from its inception until my departure from Cornell. Her work was that of a true associate and collaborator and I am deeply indebted to her for her contributions both intellectual and personal.

Finally, this project would not have been what it was without the contributions of its student participants. The teacher-student relationship in the American university at the undergraduate level tends to be superficial. This project not only permitted me to work closely with students in their intellectual problems but to come to know them as individuals, a somewhat crucial knowledge if teaching is going to be effective. But it is not only for its "efficiency" that I am grateful; through the project, I got to know 34 students in ways that I have rarely gotten to know other students. We worked our summer together and sweated out the preparation and analysis together. I have maintained contact with most of them and feel closer to them than I have to graduate students who have studied with me. If only in this respect, this project has been a worthwhile learning experience for me.

William H. Friedland
Santa Cruz
February 1, 1971

THE INTEGRATION OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH

This project had its origins in Berkeley 1964.

Prior to Berkeley and its Free Speech Movement, there seemed little point to being concerned with undergraduate instruction. One could try, one could innovate, but always the innovation existed within the paralyzing framework of the emphasis upon research, publication, mainstream sociology, and its accompaniment of emphasis on graduate instruction.

The situation was typified by the personal situation of the principal investigator. Research was focused upon social change in Africa, in particular on the development of trade unionism and industrial relations. Even within a unit such as the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations such an esoteric subject could attract students only by the ones and twos. Thus, research was intended for a purely professional audience of sociologists and Africanists--all part of the general professional world and having little or nothing to do with Cornell and instruction at Cornell.

Teaching, whether graduate or undergraduate, was concerned with other matters: formal organization, introductory sociology, social movements. The closest intersections between research and teaching occurred in teaching classes on social change (with a focus on Africa) and a general social structural class on Africa (which included two lectures on unionism). Thus, almost complete separation.

As Berkeley began to bite into the American university system, a search began for ways to improve undergraduate instruction. The particular approach taken in this study of agricultural labor was to attempt to build a project which would reintegrate instruction and research, that would provide better instruction in sociology for undergraduates while providing research data out of which professional careers are (and continue to be) built.

The choice of agricultural labor as the focus was deliberate. Cut off from urban centers, Cornell University is nevertheless strategically placed in the center of a major concentration of rural agricultural workers. Indeed, the University is itself an employer of such workers. Thus, the geographical location made feasible the use of the University as a base while the subject matter was one calculated to engage the interests of students.

Unlike most such projects, this project was not designed to follow standard sociological practices and to be treated simply as a study. The project was therefore designed to permit students to generate data through their own involvements. That those involvements created problems in the East--where most students were white and middle class while all migrants with whom we had contact were black--can easily be imagined. Those problems, as they were confronted by students, also became additional data.

The integration of teaching and research in the program was carried out through four phases of activity:

1. Careful selection of student participants. Unlike most university courses, involvement in the program had to be limited to highly motivated and extremely adaptable students. Selection was accomplished not only through preliminary screening of participants but also during the preparatory seminar, the second phase.

2. A preparatory seminar was held during the academic term preceding the period of summer field work. This seminar involved an examination of existing literature on research techniques and methodologies and on migrant labor, a number of guest lectures, and a series of small research assignments designed to familiarize students with unusual research situations and to encourage them to develop techniques to deal competently with such situations.

3. Field research took place during an eight-week period in the summer. The men involved were established in a living and working situation in migrant labor camps. The women in the project lived in apartments in towns near where the men were placed. The women had dual functions: (a) to maintain liaison between the men in the camps and the principal investigator, and (b) as researchers in the community. The men would leave the camp two or three evenings a week for liaison purposes and to record field notes (which could not be done in the camps). The liaison meetings were beneficial in several ways. Aside from the academic value of recording data on a regular basis, these sessions served to keep participants in touch with one another and to allow them to share and benefit from one another's field experiences. In addition to the regular liaison meetings, a weekend conference was held for all participants in the middle of the field work period.

4. An analysis seminar was held during the academic term following the summer field work. In this seminar, the field experience was analyzed and the data examined and criticized. Papers were written on various aspects of the research problem, and students became familiar with one another's work and data.

A considerable amount of data has been generated through the program. Each student kept a detailed diary (by use of the tape recorder) of his or her activities in the field, and each set of field notes has been made available to all other students in the project. The accumulated field notes and papers prepared for the seminars have been valuable to successive cohorts as well as to the on-going research of the principal investigator and the research associate. The material has also been made available to other students engaged in research in relevant areas.

The benefits of the integration of teaching and research within the project have been great. Unlike typical undergraduate "seminars," in which everyone--students and faculty--works on unrelated problems and areas, the project's seminars have had the same quality as advanced graduate seminars. Because the students and faculty member involved were working on the same problem, the work of each contributed to the whole and complemented the work of others. Since students were involved in their own research, they had a stake in the outcome and were therefore more interested and energetic in their work than is typically the case when undergraduates are merely performing tasks to aid in research in which only faculty have a stake. Student papers generated from the project have complemented faculty research, and this is also an improvement over the situation in which undergraduate research is intended to be only an "exercise" and is unrelated to faculty research. The consistently high calibre of student work during the project testifies to the value to all concerned of this method of undergraduate education in the social sciences.

An outgrowth of the successful integration of teaching and research within the project has been the adoption of a similar method by the new Community Studies major at the University of California, Santa Cruz, in carrying out a variety of projects in nearby communities. In the Santa Cruz case, the dual functions of teaching and research have been integrated also with an action or service component. This has been effected by involving the students in concrete organizational assignments in the communities to which they go and, in most case cases, with low-income groups, organizations, or agencies. Thus, the student learns while making a contribution to the agency through his work.

In its recent endeavors, Community Studies is seeking to develop longer-ranging effects on low-income organizations by the development of a mechanism to create programs within such organizations that they wish to establish but for which they have no resources. This project, known as the development of "program components," is now well underway and constitutes a logical extension of the original conception embodied in the initial Cornell Migrant Labor Project.

In summary, the teaching-research aspect of the project appears to have been its most successful component. As for its effects upon the students, the next section, written by the students themselves, will testify.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

by: Christine Johnson (UCSC)
Michael Rotkin (Cornell)
Leonard Rubin (Cornell)
Gil Stein (UCSC)
Edd Taub (Cornell)
Lillian Trager (Cornell)

Procedure

For purposes of evaluating the impact of the project on the participating students, each of the students was asked to fill out a questionnaire designed to have them make this evaluation multidimensional. After this information was collected, six students, representing the three cohorts which passed through the program, gathered in Santa Cruz to organize and interpret the data generated from these student evaluations.*

All of the participants were sent two questionnaires and were given the option of filling out either or both forms. The questionnaires were similar in content, but different in structure: the first questionnaire, which was open-ended in nature, asked the participants to comment on the impact the project had on their career orientation, their feelings about social problems, and their activities in the area of social change. The second schedule was closed-ended and was designed to objectify the content areas dealt with in the open-ended questionnaire.

Twenty nine of the 32 participants responded to the final query. Eighteen people completed the open-ended form; 20 people filled out and returned the closed-ended form. Nine people completed both forms. Some of the respondents also sent letters dealing with personal changes and impressions along with the forms.

The evaluative group met for the purpose of organizing and interpreting these data. In attempting to develop a code for the responses to the questionnaires, a number of problems relating to the use of such questionnaires for evaluative work were encountered. First, some of the students felt constrained by both forms and responded either through writing highly personal letters or not seriously filling out the forms. It is clear that the experience for some was of such a nature that it could not be communicated through this kind of procedure. Second, there were a significant number of inconsistencies in responses to some questions, e.g., in certain cases value assessments were incongruent with life choices that were made. Third, many of the respondents implicitly and explicitly stated that the project was one of many potential stimuli for changes that they had experienced. This was especially the case with people who had been out of the program for a relatively long period of time. These problems made it especially difficult to come up with any kind of general assessment of the effect of the program on the participants.

With these facts in mind, the evaluative group proceeded to its task. The completed questionnaires were distributed to the six members of the group and the data were initially coded according to the broad areas covered by the questionnaire - career choice, personal change, activity - and responses which were not applicable were deleted.

*The evaluation session was supported by a small grant from the Faculty Research Committee, UCSC.

Following the initial filtering process, the group decided to organize the data into three sections. First, the material from the closed-ended questionnaire dealing with attitudinal change and increased or decreased social change related activity resulting from project involvement were tabulated. The responses of those who filled only the open-ended questionnaires or wrote letters were discussed and coded according to the categories set down in the objective questionnaire. Second, in order to establish the effects the project might have had on career orientation, the career choices of the respondents were examined and profiles constructed to describe the different career patterns which seemed to emerge among the participants. Third, a brief general assessment of the overall program was made.

Tabular Results

The following tables were developed from the closed- and open-ended questionnaires. Both forced and open-ended responses were coded. Several responses were not appropriate to the question and are coded as "other."

Question: Did your attitude toward poor people change as a result of your field work?

	Forced Response	Open-Ended Response	Total
Yes, more sympathy	14	6	20
Yes, less sympathy	0	0	0
No, sympathetic before, no increase	5	0	5
No, unsympathetic before, remain so	0	0	0
Other	1	3	4

Question: Did your field work experience affect your analysis of U.S. society in general?

	Forced Response	Open-Ended Response	Total
Yes	19	7	26
No	1	2	3
Greatly increased social concern and awareness, I still feel as strongly	11	2	13
Greatly increased social concern and awareness but don't feel as strongly	3	0	3
Increased my social concern and awareness, still concerned	4	4	8
Increased my social concern and awareness, no longer concerned	0	0	0
Made me less concerned and aware; I remain so	1	0	1
Made me less concerned and aware; I no longer remain so	0	0	0
Other	1	3	4

Question: Since your field work, have you been more active, less active, or maintained the same level of activity in groups or programs geared to social change?

	Forced Response	Open-Ended Response	Total
More active	12	1	13
Less active	3	4	7
The same	5	4	9

As a result of the project, 14 of those who answered the closed-ended form indicated that as a result of their experience, their sympathy for the poor increased. Six who responded to the open-ended form also felt this way. No one reported being less sympathetic to the poor, although five indicated no increase in sympathy. (This was generally accompanied by a statement showing that they had had a high degree of sympathy to begin with.) Those whose answers fell into the "other" category were placed there either because of contradictory answers on the forced response form or because their answers were not relevant to the question.

Nineteen of the respondents to the closed-ended form stated that the project greatly affected their analysis of U.S. society. Of these, 11 indicated a lasting increased social awareness; three indicated a short term increase; four reported somewhat of a lasting increase, and all with some increase retained that increase. One person became less concerned, and remains so, and no one became less concerned and aware without remaining so. One response was classified "other."

Seven who responded to the open-ended form reported their analysis of U.S. society to be affected by the research experience, while two reported no effect. Their comments indicate the different degrees of impact which the project had on their analysis of tho U.S.

Two reported great and lasting increase:

> "...my participation in the Project...lent me a different perspective from which to view, and a fresh standard by which to measure Amerikan (sic) society, by which to understand in a more first-hand kind of way, some of its basic problems and inherent contradictions."

> "The study of the migrant system was a strong factor in my development towards more radical political thinking. I began to see more clearly the workings of the capitalist economy. It became evident in my mind that the powerless lower class was a necessity to the...strength and wealth of the ruling class."

Four indicated an increase in awareness which although not great, was lasting. These respondents generally entered the project with a "radical" outlook:

> "It [the project] had a definite radicalizing effect although not overwhelming since I'd entered at a pretty radical stage. It further has changed my perspective on 'political' issues and it abolished any remaining faith I'd had in traditional political processes."

Three people who answered the open-ended form were placed in the "other" category, as responses were ambiguous.

> "I don't remember going into the program with a social work or really social action orientation and I don't think I came out with one either. Ever since the summer of the project [and I imagine sometime before] I have been passing in and out of a social action frame of mind."

The question of social change-related activity following the project showed 12 "more active" responses, three "less active" and five "the same" for the closed-ended form. For the open-ended form, there was one "more active," four "less active," and four "the same."

Those "more actives" were active in groups spanning a wide range of political ideologies and general approaches. Many who were less active were so either because of career or job commitments, lack of such groups where the respondent lives, or because "I have not found a satisfactory group or organization through which to work toward social change...most of my friends and acquaintances are of a similar situation: the willingness to devote most of one's life to social change but dissatisfaction with the means available." Respondents whose activity did not change as a result of the project were generally active beforehand: "Much more interested in such groups but only a little more active."

In summary, we can say that participants gained more sympathy for the poor, had their analysis of U.S. society affected in a lasting way, and maintained or increased their activity with groups or programs relating to social change as a result of their experience.

PROFILES

Profiles of Academic Careers

All of the students in the project did further academic work in the social sciences after completing the project. Two of the students are still working on BA degrees and 27 of the remaining 30 students graduated with majors in the social sciences. Of the three remaining, one continued graduate work in the social sciences already begun before the project and the other two received their BA's in English literature.

Nine of the undergraduates went on to do graduate work in the social sciences, all but one of them in sociology or anthropology. One of the seven sociology students dropped out after receiving an MA and is now involved in radical political activity and may teach sociology at a junior college or work in "some kind of poverty project."

The eight students who remain in graduate school display considerable variety in terms of their commitment to working for social change on the one hand and the academic world on the other. One, who argues that the migrant labor project had little effect on his decision, intends to do research in the area of social theory and desires to teach sociology. He hopes to avoid future field work as much as possible and concentrate on sociological literature.

The remaining four graduate students who are strongly committed to academic careers show a greater interest in relating their work to peoples' needs outside of academia. One says the migrant labor project convinced him to stay in school and greatly radicalized his awareness of the problems of American society and increased his radical, critical ability. Another student who is presently writing his Ph.D. dissertation in sociology says "Summarizing, the Cornell Migrant Labor project did three important things for me: it educated me about what the hell is really going on, it personally emancipated me, and it gave me some direction. I can't honestly think of anything else that has happened to me in my entire life that could have had the effect that this work had on me." He plans to teach sociology, but wants to use this and his other activities as a way to work for social change.

Another sociology graduate student wants to be a "university professor and politician (especially public administration)." Because of the project, the anthropology graduate student is considering doing her major field work in this country rather than abroad and continues to be concerned with social problems.

The three remaining graduate students are less sure of their commitment to academia, but all have strong interests in working for social change. One of these "activist first, professor second" individuals writes: "What I will do with my life consists of living within a framework of critical inquiry. If I can exist in the corporation, academia, or anywhere else while holding that attitude - fine - if not I will go where I can do that." One of the others among these three expresses a more specific intention of working for a socialist revolution. He will teach if that seems useful toward that end, which it does at the present, particularly as it allows him to do campus organizing. But he may organize elsewhere depending on changing conditions in his head and the world.

In general, the project seemed to have a great effect on those students who stayed in academia and intend to go on to teaching careers. For many it was their first introduction to "the other America;" for others, it offered reinforcement of previous glimpses of inequality in the United States. For several, it offered the first attempt at systematic rather than purely emotional approaches to poverty and related social problems, and this may have been its most important contribution to these future social science teachers and/or radical organizers.

Profiles of Professional Careers

Twelve of the 29 respondents are either in professional occupations or are planning to enter a professional field. Six of these are definitely planning a legal career, with a seventh respondent leaning in that direction. All five of the respondents who are currently attending law school are involved in legal aspects of social change. Their activities range from editing the Review of Law and Social Change at New York University to participation in an investigation of public-welfare administration in Virginia.

Two of the project's participants are involved in teaching in public schools. One is currently teaching in a ghetto school, and the other plans to teach in the rural Southwest. Two other people are planning careers in social welfare; one expects to be a social worker, and the other is presently pursuing a graduate program in psycho-therapy. The remaining project participant in this category is presently working in the Peace Corps in Columbia. He plans to do graduate work in regional planning and then continue working in the Third World.

It is doubtful whether the migrant labor project significantly influenced the career plans of most of the participants who have chosen a professional career. Many of the respondents remarked that they had been planning professional careers prior to their field work experience. One notable exception, however, is the Peace Corps member who was originally planning to be a biologist, but became interested in sociology as a result of the project.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ADLAI E. STEVENSON COLLEGE

SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95060

July 24, 1972

Solicited
ack -

Eric Clearinghouse on Adult Education
107 Roney Lane
Syracuse, New York 13210

Gentlemen:

Per your recent request, I am enclosing a copy of MIGRANT LABOR--TEACHING, RESEARCH AND POLICY, A Final Report to the Ford Foundation on a Four Year Project.

Sincerely,

William H. Friedland
Professor, Community Studies
and Sociology

Enclosure

Many of the respondents, however, have indicated that their field work experience enhanced their social awareness and concern. Their present employment or educational positions indicate that they intend to devote much of their lives to furthering or facilitating social change.

Non-Career Profiles

A third classification of project participants pertains to those not currently involved in either a professional career or research and academic work in the social sciences. Of the 29 participants who responded to the evaluation form, nine can be said to fall into this category. The current orientations of these individuals are quite broad and diversified since they evidence varying degrees of interest in social change, academia, and political action.

Of the nine, three responded by saying that the project did not affect either their life style, interest in social change, or outlook on U.S. society, in any significant fashion. Although two evidenced a nostalgic remembrance of project activity, both indicated the unlikely possibility of ever participating in similar or further academic study. Of these two individuals, one is employed by a national insurance company and the other is living in a commune. The third brief response did not specify any current activity.

At the other end of the spectrum are four project participants who are now involved in a wide variety of non-career oriented social change activities. All indicated that, rather than working professionally or academically in social change programs, their life style is indicative of such an orientation. The following quotes summarize the attitudes of this group:

> "I feel very strongly that whatever I do must be related to social change. For me this has become a matter of personal integrity. I don't want to prostitute myself. Now, although I don't have a 'career,' I try to carry out my ideas for social change in all I do."
>
> "I look to collective living, collective buying, collective voting, collective education, and individual thinking to guide us through present times of crisis."

Of this group of four, one is engaged in political organizing, including various "serve-the-people" projects, such as free breakfast programs and programs related to farm-workers and other members of the poor community. One is working in radical theatre workshops. One is involved in subsistence farming, which he considers "active social change" since "any life style which challenges the consumeristic capitalistic-controlled society...is a career of social change." And the last is studying the possibilities of establishing alternative educational processes.

Between this latter group, which is involved in social change activity, and the former, which has demonstrated no further involvement or interest in this area, is a third group of two individuals. They are currently in the process of deciding where their future involvements will lie and, at that time, will commit themselves to their decisions. Both still have strong desires to put into effect their understanding and enthusiasm but have not yet found the direction that meets their intellectual and social interests and capabilities.

It should be noted that this non-career oriented group is in a general state of flux. Some entered further academic fields related to the social sciences upon graduation but left for a variety of reasons. Others foresee the possibility of returning to graduate studies of social sciences and/or social change activities.

Conclusion

It is difficult to make an assessment of the overall effects and the value of the project for the students. It obviously played an important role in many of our lives in terms of career (or non-career) choices. The academic aspect of the program differed greatly from what was going on and is going on in the social sciences these days, and its "relevance" attracted many of us into that area of academia and professional life.

Also important to many of the students were the group living situations in which the project placed us and the respect for our intellectual and research abilities demonstrated by the principal investigator.

It must be emphasized, however, that a major shortcoming of the project was in the area of policy implications and, more generally, in the question of what the project accomplished for the people we "studied." After gaining deep insights into the complexity and systemic nature of many of the problems faced by the people with whom we lived and worked, it was demoralizing and frustrating to see that little positive effect (other than our possible future contributions) will ever be felt by the migrants. The publications from the project will undoubtedly go unheeded and the courses offered did little by way of dealing with the question of solutions.

In conclusion, though, it may be said that asking a university course for solutions is asking too much. The project and its courses did offer us an excellent introduction to a major social problem in the United States and some worthwhile experience in structural analysis of social problems, and that is a crucial first step toward their solution.

Certainly many of our decisions and personal developments were caused by events and experiences other than the migrant labor project, but it would be fair to say that this project was one of the best academic and social experiments the university has offered in recent years.

RESEARCH AND POLICY

The second and third goals of this project were concerned with research, one with policy-oriented research, the other with research intended for the sociological profession. Here an evaluation of our performance must, perforce, be tentative since research and publication are on-going activities, and publications can be expected to be forthcoming from the project for some time to come. Second, the policy effects of a project such as this are extremely difficult to determine since such effects occur only after considerable periods of time.

From the viewpoint of research and publication, the inventory of completed work--and work still underway--would indicate that the design of the project satisfies the exigent demands of professional academic disciplines for publication. An examination of this inventory, included as Appendix I, indicates a considerable volume of publication since the project began.

Of the publications, it will be noted that two books have emerged from the project. One, Migrant: Agricultural Workers in America's Northeast, is scheduled for Spring 1971 publication by Holt, Rinehart and Winston. The second, still untitled, is expected to be completed by the end of the current academic year.

Each volume has been planned for distinctively different audiences and has different intentions. Migrant, constructed from the field notes and papers of the participating students, is intended for broad and general circulation. The publishers will bring it out in a soft-bound edition as part of the "Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology" series intended primarily for college audiences. At the same time, a hard-bound edition will be aimed at the general public. Migrant is intended to create broad public sympathy for the conditions of agricultural workers by describing their lives in detail. Thus, it is conceived as having legislative impact by contributing to the creation of a favorable climate for legislation in the area of agricultural labor. Book 2 is intended, in contrast, for a professional and academic audience. Containing little description, this book will be a study of systemic exploitation and will explain the continuance of a social system that has long outlived its usefulness in terms of production and productivity. It finds its explanations for the maintenance of the system in the institutional commitments of agencies of government (such as the Farm Labor Service of the U.S. Department of Labor) and in outmoded social attitudes of growers.

In addition to these two major publications, a number of articles have appeared in a variety of journals, magazines, and underground newspapers.

Of the publications, therefore, there has been a mix with some oriented toward policy development and implementation and some focused on the sociological profession. One major theoretical area within sociology that has been developed through the project, the

study of intermittent social structures, has progressed only sporadically. Its analysis involves, essentially, work in a great variety of social structures not related to agricultural labor. The pursuit of this line of theoretical inquiry would have drawn away from the primary concerns. Accordingly, it has been worked at only sporadically since an initial statement of the theoretical area in the First Annual Report.

If the research and publication phase appear satisfactory, we must admit to being far less satisfied with the policy effects of the project. As the students pointed out above, it is infuriating and frustrating to see the same systemic exploitation continued despite our depth of knowledge and desires to end such exploitation. A candid self-assessment requires the acknowledgment that we were far too passive, too traditionally academic, in conceptualizing how the project might have worked to effect change more substantially.

In developing this proposal, we are fully cognizant of the prospects. It may very well be that, even had we implemented the project as we propose below, we might not have had a better effect. But such a program of implementation would have removed the purely "academic" quality from our work; it would have thrown us into the realities of social change, the nitty-gritty of everyday politics, instead of leaving us with a somewhat dissatisfied sense, a lack of closure.

Essentially, our error consisted in conceiving of the project as one involving instruction (of students) and research. This was implemented through the three phases of preparation, field work, and analysis of field work data. What was missing was a fourth active component oriented to translating our findings and experience into workable knowledge by a great many people, a fourth component that we will call "extension."

In a sense, we had a tentative experience with "extension" when we accepted several opportunities to display our findings within Cornell University. Invited several times by the Weinberg Seminar (a public service seminar involving unions, management, and the public) and once by a class in the College of Home Economics, we made presentations of our findings. Coming first-hand from the mouths of student participants, the material we delivered had a dramatic and fresh quality that shocked our listeners. The systemically exploitative character of migrant labor was brought home in ways that cannot be accomplished even through such media as television. When a student calmly and dispassionately describes how social security deductions were made regularly from his pay despite the fact that the crew leader never asked for his social security number; or when a student described a violent knife fight, or the harsh treatment of an alcoholic by a crew leader, it carried great weight with listeners. It was personal and first-hand experience delivered directly to the listener, face-to-face.

The traditions of the academy are strong, however, and we conceived of our responsibilities only in terms of responding to requests from various agencies. We never thought of taking an aggressive orientation to bringing our findings to the public, to classes at Cornell, or at other universities, or to the legislature. If they called on us, we would respond; but we never conceived of initiating such action. In retrospect, then, it is clear that an important and useful function could have been performed had we extended the project into this fourth active phase, the extension phase.

Here we can only suggest how the extension phase might be developed. For one thing, it should be an integral part of programs such as this, with students who enter the project agreeing to take part in it (as they agreed to participate in the three active phases we did implement). The extension of their personal findings to other audiences would provide a valuable learning experience for the students--not only in terms of bringing them into contact with the public, but in forcing them to organize their ideas well so as to withstand critical examination by partisans (rather than the withdrawn and academic critical inquiry to which their ideas are submitted within the university).

But more important, by actively and aggressively putting students into a situation in which they have to extend their findings as part of a normal academic program (and for academic credit, it should be pointed out), we would make our findings available to a much broader audience. Three basic areas might be developed within which students would seek to present their personal materials:

1. To legislative bodies. While legislators have a great deal of statistical material on which to base their considerations, they have little knowledge about the defects in such statistical data nor little qualitative understanding of what goes on. The experiences of our students not only revealed many of the inadequacies of statistical data but also of administrative action. In addition, because our students come from middle class backgrounds, they could serve to convey to middle class legislators many of the horrors that they had personally witnessed.

2. To the general public. With a host of organizations interested in educating themselves about the world, there exists enormous potential in describing our experiences to such groups. Generally ineffective in any immediate sense but rooted in the solid middle class that has effects over time on some aspects of the legislative process, our students could have had a broad impact on such audiences. To reach such a public would necessitate the establishment of the equivalent of a "speakers bureau" as an integral part of the project.

3. To the university. While our feeble extension attempts were limited to the university, we could have undertaken far more to spread our information within the academy. This could have been accomplished not only through the equivalent of a "speakers bureau" but through aggressively seeking to adapt our information to the needs of faculty members in a broad variety of disciplines. Thus, we could have oriented our students to seeking out opportunities to present their findings in many different academic circumstances. Many, incidentally, did utilize their materials in some of their other classes. But such utilization was fortuitous and depended upon the individual student and faculty member rather than being an exigent part of the student's follow-up program.

Thus, the development of such a program should, in the future, build into it a distinctive component concerned with actively and aggressively requiring of the student the translation of his findings into public materials. This, it seems, is a minimum requirement of such action-oriented projects in the future.

APPENDIX

Publications of the Project

Annual Reports

William H. Friedland with the assistance of Dorothy Nelkin, First Report, Migrant Labor as a Form of Intermittent Social Organization. (Ithaca: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1967.) Also published in Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, 90th Congress, Second Session, Hearings on Migratory Labor Legislation, Part 4, Appendix II, pp. 965-1003.

_____, Second Annual Report, Field Research in Migrant Labor in New York State. (Ithaca: NYSSILR, Cornell University, July 1968.)

_____, Third Annual Report, Cornell Migrant Labor Project. (Ithaca: NYSSILR, Cornell University, May 1969.)

Dorothy Nelkin, Fourth Report, Aspects of the Migrant Labor System. (Ithaca: NYSSILR, Cornell University, February 1969.)

William H. Friedland, Migrant Labor--Teaching, Research and Policy: A Final Report to the Ford Foundation on a Four Year Project. (Santa Cruz: University of California, February 1971.)

Books

William H. Friedland and Dorothy Nelkin, Migrant: Agricultural Workers in America's Northeast. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, in press.)

William H. Friedland, Systemic Exploitation: The Social Structure of Migratory Labor. (In preparation.)

Dorothy Nelkin, On the Season: Aspects of the Migrant Labor System. (Ithaca: NYSSILR, Cornell University, 1971.)

Articles

William H. Friedland, "Labor Waste in New York: Rural Exploitation and Migrant Workers," Trans-Action, Vol. 6, No. 4, February 1969, pp. 48-53. Industrial and Labor Relations Reprint Series, No. 258.

_____, "Making Sociology Relevant: A Teaching-Research Program for Undergraduates," The American Sociologist, Vol. 4, No. 2, May 1969, pp. 104-110. ILR Reprint Series, No. 265.

Articles - Continued

William H. Friedland with the assistance of Dorothy Nelkin, "Migrant Labor: A Form of Intermittent Social Organization," Industrial and Labor Relations Research, Vol. 13, No. 2, November 1967, pp. 3-14.

Dorothy Nelkin, "A Response to Marginality: The Case of Migrant Farm Workers," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 20, No. 4, December 1969, ILR Reprint Series, No. 282. Reprinted in Norman Whitten and John Szwed (eds.), Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives. (The Free Press; Glencoe, 1970.)

_____, "Unpredictability and Life Style in a Migrant Labor Camp," Social Problems, Vol. 17, No. 4, Spring 1970.

Michael Rotkin, "Starvation 35 Miles from Ithaca," Dateline: Ithaca, September 4, 1968.

_____, "New York Migrant Workers," New Patriot, Nos. 48-49, August 17-31, September 1-14, 1968, and Scimitar, No. 1, 3 part article.

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUL 2 8 1972
on Adult Education